

with the fourth attack on the innocent Israeli victims, which has killed 61 people, injured 190 people, is certainly something this country, the United States, will not tolerate. The Hamas organization has caused such terror and such grief that the once solid confidence of the people in Israel has been shaken. We here in America will show our support in every way possible, whether it is economic, humanitarian, in any way that Israel needs our help. It is our strongest ally in the Middle East, and a democracy that is so important to this country and the world's peace. We must be there to help them.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER
AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT
ON H.R. 1561, FOREIGN RELATIONS
AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL
YEARS 1996 AND 1997

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 375 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 375

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1561) to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. For purposes of debate only, Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to include extraneous material.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple, fair rule providing for House consideration of the conference report on H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interests Act—otherwise known as the State Department Reauthorization. As is the custom for conference reports, this rule allows for 1 hour of general debate and preserves the right of the minority to offer a motion to recommend, with or without instructions. Finally, the rule waives all points of order against the conference report and its consideration. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1561 was passed by the House on June 8, 1995. Since that time, Members in both Houses have invested a great deal of time and energy working to make this the first year since 1985 that we have reauthorized the State Department

programs in this bill. In our Rules Committee hearing last week, both Chairman GILMAN and the ranking minority member, Mr. HAMILTON, said they were encouraged by the efforts that the conference committee has made to bring us this far. Unfortunately, I understand that the President is planning to veto this reform-minded initiative, essentially because it will cramp his unique foreign policy style.

In response, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I think we all understand that the responsibility for conducting foreign policy rests primarily but certainly not exclusively with the executive branch. Today, this long overdue legislation recognizes and addresses the responsibility of the legislative branch in this area—responsibility it has passed on over much of the past 10 years. These duties include policy oversight and, most importantly, laying out the broad priorities for the expenditure of U.S. tax dollars overseas. In this respect, Congress must share some of the blame for our current confused and inconsistent foreign policy agenda. However, it is clear that the lion's share of the blame for recent flip-flops, diplomatic gaffs, excessive costs and ill-defined missions rests squarely with President Clinton and his foreign policy "B" team. To date, the Clinton administration has focussed its priorities and resources on extensive involvement on high-visibility—low-yield projects in Northern Ireland, Bosnia and Haiti—to the point where the United States has been actively engaged in the de facto governance of two out of these three regions. While the administration may have the best of intentions, its focus on these efforts has resulted in the neglect and/or mismanagement of critical situations in Cuba and Taiwan, to name just two. Today, the administration is finally getting around to recognizing that Fidel Castro is not such a nice guy, and that a Chinese invasion of Taiwan could threaten the entire balance of power in Asia and the Pacific—but I am afraid that the reason it took so long to arrive at these rather obvious conclusions is that the White House has conducted United States foreign policy in the same way it has conducted domestic policy: setting priorities by what the opinion polls say, bowing to pressure from hunger-striking activists, and giving more attention to photo ops that will resonate with the voters instead of doing the hard work of conducting a vigorous and consistent policy agenda across the globe based on a clear delineation of what our national security interests really are in today's world.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that passage of H.R. 1561 will begin to put us back on the right track by freeing up foreign policy assets and making them reflect changing priorities in a changing world. It does make some necessary cuts to the operating expenses of the bureaucracy at the State Department and agencies like USAID, USIA, and

ACDA—a total of \$1.7 billion over 4 years—and requires one of these agencies to be consolidated into the State Department. It also includes many other important provisions, including asserting the supremacy of the Taiwan Relations Act, and setting strict reporting requirements for the Bosnia operation. I would urge my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 375 makes it in order to consider the conference report on H.R. 1561, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal years 1996 and 1997. As our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] has explained, it waives all points of order against the conference report.

The conference report authorizes appropriations for the State Department, and it requires the President to select and abolish at least one foreign affairs agency among the Agency for International Development, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, or the U.S. Information Agency, USIA. We have concerns about the substance of this conference report, as well as the manner in which the conference was conducted.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the ranking Democrat on the Committee on International Relations, told the Committee on Rules that a Democratic alternative to the conference agreement was dismissed out of hand. Furthermore, the gentleman from Indiana said that he as the ranking member never saw the conference agreement before it was filed. He told the Committee on Rules "With this kind of approach, we are not making laws, we are making political statements."

Furthermore, I want to express strong objections to the provisions in this conference agreement, as our colleagues know. If the measure is presented to the President in its current form, he has said that he will veto the bill. This bill could result in the abolition of AID, the Agency for International Development. This agency provides vital assistance to millions of poor and hungry people in developing nations. The small amount, the really tiny amount of savings that his, perhaps, would achieve could come at a terrible loss to human life and to our international standing around the world.

The funding levels contained in this bill are inadequate to protect the foreign policy interests of the United States. The bill would seriously undermine our ability to conduct diplomacy and operate overseas posts of foreign affairs agencies. If the bill passes, our Nation would retreat like a turtle into its shell, avoiding our international responsibilities and opportunities. That should not, it seems to us, be the image of our great Nation.

We are, however, pleased with a provision in the bill that prohibits the United States from selling small arms to Indonesia. This provision was included in response to that country's 1975 invasion and continued military presence in the island territory of East Timor, where numerous deaths and human rights abuse have occurred. We are glad this legislation does not let the East Timor tragedy go unnoticed.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield such time he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of House Resolution 375, the rule governing consideration of the conference report on H.R. 1561, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. I commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], my good friend and colleague, chairman of the Committee on Rules, for his committee's expeditious consideration of the rule, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], for advocating the adoption of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to list at this point the main provisions of the conference report, an important conference report. This bill is the first major authorization bill reorganizing the international affairs agencies designed back in the 1950's to fight the cold war. It is also the first Republican foreign affairs authorization bill in 40 years.

In short, the bill will require the President to abolish one of three international affairs agencies, either the USIA, AID, or ACDA, moving their functions back into the State Department, pursuant to the initial suggestion by Secretary Christopher.

It mandates \$1.3 billion in budget savings below the fiscal year 1995 spending levels for the operating expenses of State, of AID, of USIA, and ACDA over the next 4 years. It provides authorization of appropriations totaling \$6.5 billion for fiscal year 1996 and 1997 to fund the State Department, to fund USIA, to fund ACDA, AID, and related programs. This represents a \$500 million reduction from fiscal year 1995 spending on these programs.

It also eliminates the AID housing guarantee program that GAO estimates will lose over \$1 billion of the taxpayers' money, the Roth-Gejdenson section. It includes the MacBride principles of economic justice for aid to Northern Ireland. It includes the Humanitarian Corridors Act language, conditioning aid to Turkey on releasing United States humanitarian aid to Armenia. It includes many administration-requested provisions to improve the management of the State Department; in other words, allowing the

State Department to collect from insurers for free medical care provided.

□ 1700

It authorizes full administration requests for narcotics control assistance and for the Peace Corps. This bill also imposes a number of important human rights restrictions carefully modified to meet the concerns of the administration. Major provisions include the supremacy of the Taiwan Relations Act over executive agreements and reporting on United States involvement in Bosnia to ensure our mission fulfills its stated purpose of bringing about a lasting and just peace and further restricts the use of refugee funds for involuntary repatriation of genuine refugees or persons in serious danger of subjection to torture.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and look forward to their support for the important conference report.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 22 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California has 27½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me this time.

I urge Members to support this rule. It is a good rule, and it is a very good, comprehensive conference report that we have put together. It has taken our subcommittee and the full committee the better part of a year and a half, working with the Senate, to craft this legislation. There were delays, as I think many Members know, on the Senate side, regrettably, but thankfully we are going to have this bill presented to the whole House very shortly.

H.R. 1561, the Foreign Relations Authorizations Act for 1996 and 1997 has attracted attention, Mr. Speaker, including a veto threat from the Clinton administration, because it would require the consolidation of at least one Government agency and because it would save \$1.7 billion over 4 years.

I think it is important that, with the taxpayers clamoring for downsizing throughout the Federal bureaucracy, that the State Department and other agencies of our foreign policy apparatus not be immune to the budget-cutting knife.

Amid the discussion of these issues, however, some of the most important aspects of H.R. 1561 have gone almost unnoticed. Specifically, despite the need to cut spending and consolidate programs, the conference report manages to hold harmless, and at times even enhances, the most important programs and to enact important pol-

icy provisions that will indeed support freedom, democracy, and save lives.

Mr. Speaker, in considering H.R. 1561, I hope we will carefully consider the following human rights provisions:

First, Mr. Speaker, the Humanitarian Corridors Act. Section 1617 of the bill will limit assistance to those countries that restrict the transport or delivery of U.S. humanitarian assistance. I introduced the Humanitarian Corridors Act and offered the entirety of that legislation to this bill for a very simple reason: It is wrong, patently wrong, for countries receiving American assistance to keep U.S. humanitarian aid from reaching other countries. Yet this is precisely being done by Turkey, which has been blocking Armenia for several years. Ankara's opening of an air corridor with Armenia last summer indeed was a step in the right direction, but it does not represent a remedy for the problem. Turkey still refuses to open land routes through its territory for the delivery of badly needed United States humanitarian assistance to Armenia, which creates an unacceptable situation.

The MacBride principles, another very, very important set of principles that for years we have been trying to get enacted into law, Mr. Speaker, section 1615 of the bill includes language that guarantees United States assistance programs in Northern Ireland will only go towards projects that do not engage in religious discrimination and which provide employment opportunities for members of the region's Catholic minority. Some of us in Congress have been fighting, as I said, for these principles for many years. It has been a bipartisan effort. We have the opportunity to codify that this evening.

Chairman GILMAN, I think, deserves particular credit for his tenacity for steering this important human rights provision through this legislation and including it.

Refugee protection, the refugee provisions, Mr. Speaker, of H.R. 1561 will prevent the United States tax dollars from being spent to return to Vietnam and Laos thousands of men and women who served side by side with the American forces during the Vietnam war.

These provisions will also restore the Reagan and Bush policy of protecting people who can show that they are fleeing forced abortion or forced sterilization or they have actually been subjected to such cruel measure, such as the women who are now being held in California and in other parts of the country.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1561 would also require periodic reports to Congress on what Fidel Castro is doing to enforce his end of the Clinton-Castro immigration deal of 1994 and how people are treated who are returned to Cuba pursuant to the second Clinton-Castro immigration deal of May of 1995.

Despite the need for cuts, Mr. Speaker, in international broadcasting and other public diplomacy programs, H.R. 1561 holds harmless two of our freedom

broadcasting programs, such as Radio Free Asia and Radio and TV Marti.

The bill also requires, when cuts must be made, they must not fall disproportionately on broadcasts to countries, such as Iran and Iraq, where people do not enjoy freedom of information within their own country.

The bill also requires that Radio Free Asia commences its broadcasts into China, Vietnam, North Korea, Burma, and other countries whose people do not enjoy freedom and democracy, as we all know so well, within 6 months. No more delays; it is about time this important broadcasting got up and running.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule, and I believe it is a very, very comprehensive conference report. As I think Members know, there were objections made by the other body when it came to the foreign aid section. That has been taken out of this bill, so we are talking basically about consolidation and about reauthorizing many of our important programs like USIA, the State Department refugee assistance.

I urge support for the rule.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned with provisions in the bill which could result in the abolition of USAID, the U.S. Agency for International Development. This Agency provides vital assistance to millions of poor and hungry people in developing nations. The small amount of savings would come at a terrible loss to human life and to our international standing.

Mr. Speaker, the abolishment of USAID is a misguided idea that will lead to increased pain and suffering in the poorest countries of the world and it will reduce the effectiveness of the United States in international affairs. Now is the worst time to be thinking of getting rid of USAID. While the world is becoming increasingly interdependent, there are civil breakdowns in places like Bosnia and Rwanda, and there are outbreaks of deadly diseases in remote regions of the world. I think at this time there are 25 major humanitarian crises going on in the world.

I have been particularly impressed by the work of Brian Atwood as administrator of USAID. He has done an excellent job transforming USAID into an agency that improves its performance at the same time making dramatic budget reforms. In recent years, under Atwood's leadership, USAID has reduced senior management by nearly one-third and he has eliminated 90 organizational units in Washington. He also achieved \$7 million in cost savings

over 5 years by combining administrative functions with other Government agencies.

If this bill passes, our Nation will retreat like a turtle into its shell, avoiding our international responsibilities and opportunities. This is not my image of our Nation, and it should not be ours.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the gentleman from Ohio and mention that we have provided discretionary authority to the President to eliminate one of three agencies, not mandating that AID be eliminated, giving the President the opportunity to decide between AID, USIA, or ACDA, the Arms Control Agency. So there is no mandate, and I just wanted to make certain that the gentleman understands that there is no mandate to remove AID.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would just respond to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that I am aware of the fact that it does not mandate that USAID go out of business, or not exist. It gives the choice. It could be one of three agencies.

I think it is felt by many of us here in Congress and many people in the administration that if they are given this, and I hope that they are not given this choice, that probably USAID will be given a direction to eliminate that, and I do not even want it considered in the legislation.

I think USAID is probably one of the more important programs that we have and when we consider where we used to be years ago, when we had \$19 or \$20 billion in foreign aid, which is like less than one-half of 1 percent of our total budget and now it is at \$12 billion, and we want to eliminate the humanitarian agency in the whole Government when, in fact, it saves millions and millions of lives, I would not say every year but over the many, many years, to put them into the equation that they possibly could be abolished I think is a wrong way to go.

I think the people that we have at AID, starting with Brian Atwood, have done a very impressive job. I am very enthused about their direction, their vision for the future, and what this world is about as far as humanitarian concerns are concerned.

I just think we are going the wrong way here, and it makes us look like we are retreating on one of the most important issues that we have to deal with in the Congress of the United States.

People were asked in several polls, "Would you be willing to fund humanitarian issues, humanitarian types of aid in countries overseas," and almost

90 percent of the people agreed that that was a good thing to do.

They also said in the poll, "Would you be willing to give 100 extra dollars in tax moneys to humanitarian aid," and they said if they could be assured that the money was going to the poorest of the poor, they would be glad to do it. I was amazed by that poll.

Another poll showed that a lot of people believe that, you know, our foreign aid, when they did this poll across the country, that of our total budget, that somewhere between 18 and 22 percent of the people believed that, I am sorry, of the people polled, they believed that the total amount going to foreign aid, 18 to 22 percent was the amount of money going to foreign aid from our total budget. And they said, "What actually do you think the money ought to be," and the numbers said they thought it ought to be 8 to 9 percent when, in fact, all we are arguing about here today is less than one-half of 1 percent. This is the aid that goes to humanitarian issues, the many crises going on in the world today.

So even to raise the issue, to have the possibility that it would be eliminated, to put it into the State Department, would be a political decision, I think, that would not work for the poorest of the poor and would hurt them. And I think it would go a long way in not bringing the kind of child survival activities and the type of micromanagement kinds of things that we need overseas in development assistance.

I oppose this bill. I do not think it is a good idea.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to comment on another matter relative to this, if I may, at this time.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, we had been considering making a point of order against consideration of this rule. Section 425, as opposed to 426 of that same act, states that a point of order lies against legislation which, one, imposes an unfunded mandate in excess of \$50 million actually against State or local governments, or, two, does not publish prior to floor consideration a CBO estimate of any unfunded mandates in excess of \$50 million annually for State and local entities or in excess of \$100 million annually for the private sector.

Section 426 of the Budget Act specifically states that the Committee on Rules may not waive this point of order. However, on page 2, lines 9 and 10 of House Resolution 375, which we are discussing here today, all points of order are waived against the conference report and against consideration. For that reason we were, as I said, considering making a point of order. This rule should not have been considered pursuant to this rule 426.

□ 1715

We decided not to pursue that point of order for a number of reasons, one of them being an unusual CBO estimate that we have heard about but have not yet seen. But we do think it is important to discuss very briefly, and I shall be very brief, Mr. Speaker, our reasons for objecting to the waiver of the unfunded mandate rule.

We should, of course, be sticking with the rules. Our good friends on the other side of the aisle came up with this proposal at the beginning of last year, and since that time have consistently waived it. We think we ought to take some of these rules a little bit more seriously and perhaps not pass them in the first place if we are not going to pay much attention to them.

This particular conference report has four refugee-related provisions which, taken together, may well result in increased costs to individual States throughout this country. There are good arguments on both sides of the question of whether these four provisions represent unfunded mandates, and apparently CBO itself is having some trouble coming up with a definitive answer.

What I want to say and be clear about is we would have made the point of order not because of necessarily opposition to the four particular provisions dealing with refugees, but because of our understanding of the intention of the unfunded mandates law, which is to provide full and open debate on any issues or that may raise unfunded mandates for the States. That, after all, was the expressed purpose from our friends on the other side as part of their Contract for that particular change in our rules.

Allowing for debate on the unfunded mandates question in this bill would provide one way to alert States that the Congress is in fact taking action which may well have come impact on state costs. It would give some notice to the States that the States' costs may increase or that State programs may assume some new burdens or may in fact need to be changed to avoid those burdens because of this particular legislation which Congress in fact will be considering today as soon as we are through with the rule.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me simply say that Members should be aware that this legislation does in fact contain provisions which could impose unfunded costs on State and local governments. Last year, as we have just discussed, the House overwhelmingly approved legislation that would help identify instances of unfunded mandates on public and private sector entities. In fact, much of the month of January of 1995 was consumed by that particular piece of legislation.

We find it somewhat ironic, after all the debate that took place at that time, particularly with regard to protecting Members' rights to be informed about unfunded mandates, that on one of the first major authorization bills that is coming out of the Committee on Rules since that time, the Repub-

licans are apparently attempting to allow legislation that imposes unfunded costs on State and local governments without our raising that point. Most on that side of the aisle, and I guess a lot of Members on our side of the aisle as well, voted for the unfunded mandates bill.

We simply hope that Members will think long and hard about what a "yes" vote on this rule in fact proves. If one is truly opposed to the imposition of unfunded mandates on the States by the Federal Government, then we suggest that one would oppose this particular rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague the gentleman from California. Old friendships are worth a lot around here.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of the provision to withhold funding for expanding diplomatic relations until the President certifies that the Vietnamese government "fully cooperates" in accounting for our MIAs. This measure is essential to achieve the fullest possible accounting of our missing heroes. In repeated testimony before my subcommittee the most senior Defense Department analysts who investigate this issue have stated under oath that the Vietnamese continue to hold back critical information on servicemen who were known to have been alive under Communist control in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

In January, the U.S. Government gave the Vietnamese a list of 69 MIAs that based on the Defense Department's recent "comprehensive review" of all MIA cases. The review shows that there are over 400 MIAs who were last known alive or dead under Vietnamese control whom the Vietnamese can provide either bodily remains or their own documents, records and witnesses that can resolve their fates.

Based on this official review, I provided the Vietnamese with an additional 29 priority MIAs that the Communists should be able to account for. About a dozen of these cases overlap with the Defense Department list. All together the Vietnamese has been given the names of 75 MIAs that the U.S. Government knows they can account for immediately. And on January 20, 1996 while visiting Hanoi Assistant Secretary of State Winston Lord expressed to the Vietnamese "disappointment in the level and quality of work that the Vietnam government Office for Missing Persons performs on cases." Although the Vietnamese dribble out isolated records and documents to manipulate the political debate in this Congress, the bottom line is that they are continuing to torture the families of our missing heroes. We have the power to stop this cruel charade.

This provision is strongly supported by the vast majority of veterans organizations and families of the missing heroes. We have letters of support

from: the National League of POW/MIA Families, the National Alliance of POW/MIA Families, the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the Vietnam Veterans Coalition, the Veterans of the Vietnam War, Inc., The American Defense and the Vietnam Veterans of America. I strongly encourage all Members of Congress to support this much needed measure.

For the RECORD I would like to include letters from the veterans and families organizations who support this provision.

But first, Mr. Speaker, check this out.

VIETNAM

(SRV Papers Back Cuban Downing of U.S. Airplanes—BK0103131396 Hanoi Voice of Vietnam in English 1000 GMT 1 Mar 96)

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Under the title "Genuine Rights to Self Defense," the leading daily newspaper NHAN DAN and the Army paper QUAN DOI NHAN DAN on March 1 run commentaries reaffirming that the shooting down of two planes being flown by a reactionary organization involving Cuban exiles in the United States was genuine self-defense in line with international law to defend Cuba's territorial integrity and security.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF FAMILIES OF AMERICAN PRISONERS AND MISSING IN SOUTHEAST ASIA,

Washington, DC, March 12, 1996.

Hon. BEN GILMAN,
Chairman, House International Relations Committee, 2170 Rayburn House Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GILMAN: In response to the President's veto message regarding HR 1561, the League has always maintained that the Government of Vietnam could unilaterally account for hundreds of Americans, and League policy has emphasized that ability as the crucial aspect of the fullest possible accounting since the League's inception. This legislation outlines the four criteria of unilateral action by Vietnam that President Clinton set forth as his measure and the League agrees with each of them.

Recently the administration completed a comprehensive review of all cases of those Americans missing and unaccounted for from the war in Southeast Asia which confirmed that Vietnam can unilaterally respond to and make significant progress on each of these four criteria.

What is particularly strange to the League is that the veto message was sent while a high level Presidential delegation, led by a cabinet member and included a member of the President's staff, was in Vietnam to present the expectations of the United States Government from this review. This delegation is comprised of the League's Executive Director Ann Mills Griffiths and the leadership of five major veterans groups all at the invitation of the President.

We're concerned that someone in the administration may have undercut the entire purpose of the trip with this veto message while the President's delegation was in Hanoi. If the President can't support the language concerning Vietnam within this bill, then the board views this as nullifying the praise that his administration has been lauding on Vietnam for their supposed "outstanding cooperation". The League position remains as stated and will be such until Vietnam has responded in a concrete way to the President's stated criteria. This is the

President's chance to signal Vietnam that his administration is serious in upholding his four criteria.

Sincerely,

JO ANNE SHIRLEY,
Chairman of the Board.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF FAMILIES,
FOR THE RETURN OF AMERICA'S
MISSING SERVICEMEN,

March 12, 1996.

Hon. ROBERT K. DORNAN,
*Chairman, Subcommittee Military Personnel,
International Relations, 1201 Longworth
Bldg., Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN DORNAN: The National Alliance's Families and Veterans plead with you to stand firm in maintaining the provision that asks for THE LIMITATION OF FUNDING FOR UPGRADING OF THE EMBASSY IN VIETNAM TO THE LEVEL AS OF JULY 11, 1995 (Sec. 609, HR 2076) in both the AUTHORIZATION and APPROPRIATION BILLS of 1996; until such time, that President Clinton can sign on the dotted line confirming that Vietnam's Government is fully and totally cooperating. This would entail Vietnams being forthcoming with the unilateral return of U.S. Servicemen's Remains, records and documents that we known they are concealing.

At your two hearings in the Military Personnel Subcommittee on the POW/MIA travesty in the past months, testimony was received indicating that the Socialist Republic of Vietnam continues to hide information as well as the remains of our Servicemen which they dribble out slowly at their discretion to give the appearance that Vietnam is fully cooperating.

President Clinton promised that the precondition for normalized relations with Vietnam would be the fullest possible cooperation. Well, Clinton "normalized" and Communist Vietnam is still deliberately and perniciously dribbling out documents as you can see with the enclosed Reuters' story dated (3-12-96). Where is this "superb" and "splendid" cooperation by Vietnam?

Our Families, Veterans and concerned citizens thank you for your total support regarding our loved ones. Please, there should be no compromise of the House language for H.R. 2076 (Sec. 609). We ask only for honesty, and the full unilateral return of the remains of our loved ones, including the records and documents before the U.S. gives the funding for Diplomatic facilities in Vietnam.

Bless you for your stalwart support.

Sincerely,

DOLORES APODACA ALFOND,
National Chairperson.

VETERANS OF THE VIETNAM WAR, INC.,
Freeport, NY, March 12, 1996.

Hon. BEN GILMAN,
Chairman, International Relations.

Hon. ROBERT DORNAN,
Chairman, Military Personnel Subcommittee.

DEAR SIRS: The Veterans of the Vietnam War, Inc. strongly supports the provisions in the State Department Authorization and State Department Appropriations bills that deny funds for expanded relations until the Vietnamese government fully and honestly cooperates to account for American Prisoners of War and those still missing in action.

Based on sworn testimony given by General James Wold before the Military Personnel Subcommittee, who admitted that the Communist Vietnamese government continues to withhold valuable documents, including records of the Vietnamese Politburo and Central Committee, our membership is adamant that no further funding with American dollars be allocated to the expansion of rela-

tions with the Communist government of Vietnam.

These provisions strengthen the efforts of United States negotiators who are seeking the truth about the large number of POW/MIA cases. These include men last known alive or whose corpse was photo documented, and continued warehousing of remains. The Vietnamese government can unilaterally provide these remains, records and documents that will lead to resolution of this ongoing tragedy. Without this leverage, the Vietnamese Communists will never give us the answers that they are withholding on hundreds of brave Americans.

It is in the interest of the American people and the Clinton Administration that the President demands immediate resolution to the POW/MIA issue before further funding is granted.

We thank you for your dedication to our POW's and MIA's and to the TRUTH.

Sincerely,

JOYCE A. ROMMEL,
National POW/MIA Dir.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,

Washington, DC, February 27, 1996.

Hon. ROBERT DOLE,
*Senate Majority Leader, Hart Senate Office
Building, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC*

DEAR SENATOR DOLE: In December, the President vetoed the Commerce-Justice-State (CJS) appropriations bill that contains a provision which denies funds for expanded relations with Vietnam unless he certifies that Vietnamese officials are fully cooperating with efforts to account for American POW/MIAs from the Vietnam War. Under this certification provision, the State and Commerce Departments would be prohibited from expanding the number of personnel assigned to posts in Vietnam beyond what existed on July 11, 1995, and only allows the United States to operate the Liaison Office established on January 28, 1995.

The American Legion urges you to include this language in the Omnibus Appropriations Bill that is currently under consideration. The President moved to include the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in the family of nations when the President decided to normalize relations on July 11, 1995. The Administration said this will lead to progress on the issue of American Prisoners of War and Missing in Action, but regretfully, we have not found that to be true.

The Vietnamese possesses the ability to unilaterally disclose information on specific cases, as Defense Department officials have testified and their Comprehensive Review of individual cases clearly shows. Thus, we should emphasize this fact and show how important the POW/MIA issue continues to be to the American people by limiting funds for diplomatic facilities in Vietnam subject to the President's certification that Vietnam is "fully cooperating."

The American Legion expects the fullest possible accounting of our POW/MIAs, and believes that withholding funds for diplomatic facilities would restore at least some of the leverage the United States has surrendered while prematurely normalizing relations with Vietnam.

The American Legion thanks you for your continuing strong support on this important issue.

Sincerely,

DANIEL A. LUDWIG,
National Commander.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, DC, March 12, 1996.

Hon. ROBERT K. DORNAN,
Hon. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
*House of Representatives, 1201 Longworth
House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES DORNAN AND GILMAN: The provisions in section 609 of H.R. 1561 are consistent with the DAV's position, as embodied in and mandated by a resolution adopted in National Convention, that calls for release of any Americans who may still be held captive, return of the remains of deceased service members, and the fullest possible accounting of those still missing as a condition to increasing our relations with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. The DAV therefore supports the provisions of section 609 and urges that they be retained in the bill.

Sincerely,

RICHARD F. SCHULTZ
National Legislative Director.

NATIONAL VIETNAM
VETERANS COALITION,

Washington, DC, March 12, 1996.

Re Appropriation Bill (H.R. 2076, Sec. 609)—
Limitation of funding for the upgrading
of the U.S. Embassy in the Socialist Re-
public of Vietnam.

Rep. ROBERT DORNAN,
*Chairman, Military Personnel Subcommittee,
1201 Longworth Bldg., Washington, DC.*

Rep. BEN GILMAN,
*Chairman, House International Relations, 2449
Rayburn House Office Bldg., Washington,
DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: The FY 1996 Commerce/Justice/State House Appropriations Bill passed the House on March 7, 1996, keeping in tact Section 609—"Limitation of the use of funds for diplomatic facilities in Vietnam". It is our understanding that President Clinton is now seeking to VETO this bill in opposition to Section 609.

The National Vietnam Veterans Coalition urges President Clinton to reassess his position on this matter. The Coalition in its entirety, strongly and unanimously supports the present language of this bill. This provision is necessary to assure a full accounting of American POW/MIAs. This provision will also enhance prospects of U.S. Vietnamese economic relations by firmly demonstrating to Vietnam that the United States will accept nothing less than honesty in all relations that affect both nations.

We are asking that the President do nothing more than what he, himself has always committed to the American people. In January, the United States told Vietnam that resolving the fate of missing U.S. servicemen would be its priority regarding any future ties between the two countries and said at that time we wanted more progress.

As we all know this has not happened. Again, we are urging the President to reassess his position and to sign this bill in its entirety.

Sincerely,

J. THOMAS BURCH, Jr.,
*Chairman, National
Vietnam Veterans Coalition.*

AMERICAN DEFENSE INSTITUTE
March 12, 1996.

Hon. ROBERT K. DORNAN
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Personnel,
House of Representatives, LHOB-1201,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DORNAN: The American Defense Institute respectfully requests the House to make one final effort to obtain information on missing U.S. servicemen before our nation fully embraces Vietnam. The House can demonstrate to the Hanoi government America's continuing concern about

men like James Kelly Patterson, my navigator, whose name surfaced in the Foreign Broadcast Information System, February 28, 1996, stating that evidence exists that he had been forced to work at a secret arms testing site in the Soviet Republic of Kazakhstan. Denying diplomatic funding in the Commerce, State, Justice Appropriations Bill (section 609 of H.R. 2076) as passed by the House, will help accomplish a final resolution to this national tragedy.

The Administration has clearly stated the nation's intention to move forward with diplomatic ties with Vietnam. At the same time, Department of Defense officials have testified that there has not been full disclosure of information Vietnam can provide to account for missing Americans. Is it not unreasonable to limit diplomatic activity until that information is forthcoming? Can we do less for our fallen soldiers?

As a defense policy organization, the American Defense Institute considers the nation's continuing effort to obtain information on missing service personnel to be critical to the morale of those serving in the military today. On behalf of those active duty men and women, POW/MIA families who still wait for answers, the majority of former Vietnam POWs, and most of the nation's 27 million veterans, we urge the Senate to join with the House of Representatives and say with one voice to the government of Vietnam that full diplomatic relations with the United States must be earned by providing all available information on missing Americans.

Sincerely,

EUGENE B. MCDANIEL,
President.

DORNAN TWO DOZEN MIA CASES TO BE UNILATERALLY RESOLVED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF VIETNAM

Refno 0021.—Versace, Humberto Rocque.
Refno 0024.—Roraback, Kenneth M.
Refno 0050.—Cook, Donald Gilbert.
Refno 0054.—McLean, James Henry.
Refno 0096.—Hall, Walter Louis.
Refno 0105.—Lindsey, Marvin Nelson.
Refno 0162.—Pogreba, Dean Andrew.
Refno 0215.—Nordahl, Lee E.
Refno 0691.—Patterson, James Kelly.
Refno 1329.—Francisco, Sam DeWayne.
Refno 1329.—Morrison Joseph C.
Refno 1388.—Brucher, John Martin.
Refno 1402.—McDonnell, John Terrence.
Refno 1405.—Luna, Carter Pervis.
Refno 1437.—Brashear, William James.
Refno 1437.—Mundt, Henry G.
Refno 1456.—Sparks, Donald L.
Refno 1625.—Duke, Charles R.
Refno 1719.—Burnett, Sheldon John.
Refno 1747.—Pearce, Dale Allen.
Refno 1747.—Soyland, David Pecor.
Refno 1748.—Entrican, Dannya D.
Refno 1843.—Wiles, Marvin Benjamin C.
Refno 1927.—Borah, Daniel Vernon Jr.
Refno 1934.—Anderson, Robert Dale.
Refno 1945.—Brown, Robert Mack.
Refno 1945.—Morrisey, Robert D.
Refno 1948.—Stafford, Ronald Dean.
Special Case, Laos—Renno 0084.—Hrdlicka, David Louis

WOLD LIST DPMO CASES REQUIRING CRITICAL VIETNAMESE ASSISTANCE

0023.—Cody, Howard Rudolph.
0024.—Roraback, Kenneth M.
0047.—Tadios, Leonard Masayon.
0048.—Parks, Joe.
0049.—Bennett, Harold George.
0050.—Cook, Donald Gilbert.
0052.—Hertz, Gustav.
0077.—Shea, James Patrick.
0086.—Walker, Orien J.
0096.—Compa, Joseph James, Jr.

0096.—Curlee, Robert Lee, Jr.
0096.—Hagen Craig Louis.
0096.—Hall, Walter Louis.
0096.—Johnson, Bruce G.
0096.—Owens, Fred Monroe.
0096.—Saegaert, Donald Russell.
0097.—Holland, Lawrence Thomas.
0099.—Schumann, John Robert.
0105.—Lindsey, Marvin Nelson.
0121.—Gray, Harold Edwin, Jr.
0266.—Smith, Harold Victor.
0301.—Mape, John Clement.
0315.—Cooper, William Earl.
0326.—Malone, Jimmy M.
0350.—Alberton, Bobby Joe.
0350.—Edmondson, William Rothroc.
0350.—McDonald, Emmett Raymond.
0350.—Shingledecker, Armon D.
0350.—Stickney, Phillip J.
0430.—Eaton, Curtis Abbot.
0435.—Milikin, Richard M., III.
0476.—Taylor, Danny Gene.
0512.—Scungio, Vincent Anthony.
0529.—Niehouse, Daniel Lee.
0542.—Begley, Burriss Nelson.
0586.—Silva, Claude Arnold.
0589.—Poor, Russell Arden.
0641.—O'Grady, John Francis.
0680.—Jefferson, James Milton.
0727.—Apodaca, Victor Joe., Jr.
0732.—Klemm, Donald M.
0826.—Moore, Herbert William, Jr.
1065.—Hunt, Robert W.
1093.—Ray, James Michael.
1112.—Cichon, Walter Alan.
1258.—Acosta-Rosario, Humberto.
1260.—Ferguson, Walter, Jr.
1277.—Shark Earl E.
1329.—Francisco, San DeWayne.
1329.—Morrison, Joseph C.
1456.—Sparks, Donald L.
1504.—Cook, Glenn Richard.
1538.—Long, Carl Edwin.
1719.—Ard, Randolph Jefferson.
1719.—Burnett, Sheldon John.
1843.—Wiles, Marvin Benjamin C.
1870.—Fowler, James Alan.
1870.—Seuell, John W.
1924.—Buell, Kenneth Richard.
1934.—Anderson, Robert Dale.
1940.—Hall, James Wayne.
1952.—McElvain, James Richard.
1952.—Ward, Ronald J.
1965.—Bennett, Thomas Waring, Jr.
1978.—Bush, Elbert Wayne.
1978.—Deane, William Lawrence.
1978.—Lauterio, Manuel Alonzo.
1978.—Stinson, William Sherril.
1978.—Wilson, Mickey Allen.

69 INDIVIDUALS.—(51 CASES)

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, if passed into law, this bill would be the beginning of the U.S. withdrawal from the international arena.

If this bill passes, the United States is on the slippery slope toward isolationism, and as the last superpower, the United States cannot withdraw from the world. Sections of this bill force the United States to retreat from further engagement in world affairs.

American leadership in the international arena is directly threatened by this bill. The conduct of foreign policy is a significant Presidential prerogative. It is not the prerogative of the Congress. Presidential authority to conduct foreign policy and direct na-

tional security legislation is severely curtailed by this bill.

The President should always be prepared to consult the Congress in foreign policy questions, but this bill goes too far in undermining the ability of the President to conduct foreign policy. The bill does not authorize the necessary level of funding for the President to conduct effective foreign policy.

Diplomacy is America's first line of defense. Diplomacy is essential to maintaining American leadership in world affairs. Diplomacy is also an inexpensive way to represent vital U.S. interests abroad.

I recently returned from a trip overseas in the subcontinent, and I spoke to many foreign service officers, AID officers, USIA officers. They are demoralized. They feel that their true worth and value is not appreciated by this Congress. These are men and women that risk their lives, do their jobs well, are patriotic, effective and efficient, yet they are being sent a message that their service is not important, that funding for their agency is not important, that they are furloughed.

This is not the way to treat America's diplomats. These are men and women that form the elite of the American Federal Government. They have been tested through extensive examinations. They do not deserve this treatment.

The United States spends slightly more than 1 percent of its Federal budget on international diplomacy and international assistance programs. This investment in peace and prosperity is the cornerstone of our national security policy. It is clearly cheaper to engage in diplomacy than to pay for military operations.

At this very time that we are in a state of tension between Taiwan and China, there is a provision in this bill, section 1601, amending the Taiwan Relations Act that is going to increase risk at a time of heightened tensions. This is not the time, this is not the week, this is not the day to be sending a message at a time of very heightened tensions. We have ships and destroyers in a state of alarm in Taiwan and in China. This is not the time when we abruptly shift policy and tie the President's hands.

We also have a provision on international organizations which would provide inadequate funding levels for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 and unworkable notification requirements which would undermine our diplomatic efforts in the U.N. and also are efforts to reform the U.N. system. This is not the kind of bill nor the kind of initiative we want to be sending at this time.

The bill also threatens the existence of vital international agencies in foreign policy. The U.S. Agency for International Development, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency may all be shut down by passage of this bill. At

least one of them is going to be closed down. What is America's foreign policy going to be, if not to help international markets for American firms, extending America's promise of freedom through the free flow of information, and to make the world safe from the horrors of nuclear warfare?

Mr. Speaker, this is not a good bill. There are many serious Members on the other side that know the limits and the possibilities of American foreign policy. They know that we are the last superpower. They know that, regrettably, because we resolved the Bosnia issue and many others, that the world is coming to us for leadership. When we retreat and when we say that we cannot staff our embassies and we close consulates, not providing services to Americans and not showing the American flag, that is a signal at this time of our existence when the American leadership is not only going to be questioned, but once again many are going to say that the American giant, the country that is a hope for freedom and diplomacy and democracy, is not out there to do its job.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a good bill. It should not be passed. The President's right to conduct foreign policy should be maintained, and this bill does not do that.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, I simply want to commend the gentleman who just spoke for his excellent and his very thoughtful statement. His points, especially those made relative to the fine men and women who serve us overseas and what we owe them, I think could not have been better said.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Mexico, perhaps more than any Member of this Congress, knows how helpful Members of this Congress can be in the execution of foreign policy, and I think that it is correct to say that foreign policy is not the exclusive right of the executive branch. It is an area where we both have an interest.

I would agree, as I said in my opening remarks, that the executive branch has primary responsibility, but we have primary oversight responsibility. Surely in terms of foreign policy of the national interests of the United States, this body has a tremendous amount to say and should have a tremendous amount to say.

Second, I would like to reply just very briefly to the remarks of my distinguished colleague from California, Mr. BEILENSEN, about this question about points of order. We had looked very closely into that ourselves, and, as traditional with conference reports, I would have waived all points of order against it. We had gotten to the conclusion, after checking with CBO, that we in fact have no unfunded mandate.

Therefore, we did not see any problem with waiving a rule when there was no unfunded mandate. In fact, I have a letter I will introduce into the RECORD from the Congressional Budget Office dated March 12, that in fact says, among other things, the bill would impose no intergovernmental private-sector mandates as defined by Public Law 1044 and would have no direct budgetary impacts on State, local, or tribal governments. I believe that as well.

Mr. Speaker, I will also include in the RECORD a statement which would have been our statement had we actually taken the point of order question to the floor. I would simply say it would be a futile gesture to provide an answer when there is no problem, although that is the kind of thing we do very well in government these days. It seems at great cost to the taxpayers, and I would put that point of order in that particular category.

Finally, I would like to urge strong support for the rule at this time. Whether one agrees with the substance of the bill, the rule is actually a pretty good rule. It should allow us to get on with our job. I think there is every reason for people to support this particular rule.

Mr. Speaker, the letter and statement referred to earlier are included for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the question of consideration of this rule and urge an "aye" vote on it. Let me make quite clear from the outset that the point of order that has triggered this separate 20-minute debate and vote is completely bogus—there are no unfunded mandates in this State Department conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the point of order was made that House Resolution 375 is in violation of section 426(a) of the Budget Act which prohibits the consideration of a rule that waives section 425 of the Budget Act relating to unfunded mandates. A section 425 point of order is triggered if the maker of the point of order can, and I quote, "specify the precise language on which it is premised."

In this case, the existence of a blanket waiver in this rule is sufficient specific language to trigger the point of order and a separate debate and vote. There is no requirement that a point of order against the rule need identify any matter in the conference report that might be in violation of the unfunded mandate procedures.

And so, while the rule waives all points of order against the conference report, implicitly including any unfunded mandate points of order, there is no provision that we are aware of in the conference report that remotely relates to mandates on State or local governments.

There were no such mandates identified by the Congressional Budget Office in the House reported bill, or in the House-passed bill, H.R. 1561, or in the Senate-passed bill. Nor are we aware of any that have been added in conference.

I would therefore submit that while the point of order may be technically valid because this is a blanket waiver, its use in this instance is an abuse of process—a dilatory tactic designed to prolong and delay consideration by the House of this boilerplate rule on a conference report that contains no unfunded mandates of order and that the House should not be subjected to additional debate and a vote where no such valid point of order would lie.

So, the question might be asked, Why not exempt the unfunded mandate point of order from the blanket waiver in the rule? The point of order that has been made against this rule is the perfect answer to that question. While you can have only one bogus point of order against the rule, you could have an infinite number raised against the conference report—each of which would trigger a separate debate and vote of the House to consider the conference report.

In other words, the minority has already made the case for the blanket waiver with this completely groundless and dilatory point of order against the rule. I would therefore urge that the motion to consider this rule be adopted.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 12, 1996.

Hon. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
Chairman, Committee on International Relations,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to the request of your staff, the Congressional Budget Office has reviewed the Conference Report to H.R. 1561, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1996 and 1997, as reported on March 8, 1996. The bill would consolidate various foreign affairs agencies, authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies, and address other matters in foreign relations.

The bill could impose no intergovernmental or private sector mandates as defined by Public Law 104-4 and would have no direct budgetary impacts on state, local, or tribal governments.

We are preparing a separate federal cost estimate for later transmittal.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contacts are Pepper Santalucia (225-3220) for effects on state, local, and tribal governments, and Eric Labs (226-2900) for impacts on the private sector.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 180, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—226

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Allard | Ganske | Nethercutt |
| Archer | Gekas | Neumann |
| Army | Geren | Ney |
| Bachus | Gilchrest | Norwood |
| Baker (CA) | Gillmor | Nussle |
| Baker (LA) | Gilman | Oxley |
| Ballenger | Goodlatte | Packard |
| Barr | Goodling | Parker |
| Barrett (NE) | Goss | Paxon |
| Bartlett | Graham | Petri |
| Bass | Greenwood | Pombo |
| Bateman | Gunderson | Porter |
| Bereuter | Gutknecht | Portman |
| Bilbray | Hancock | Pryce |
| Bilirakis | Hansen | Quillen |
| Bliley | Hastert | Quinn |
| Blute | Hastings (WA) | Radanovich |
| Boehlert | Hayes | Ramstad |
| Boehner | Hayworth | Regula |
| Bonilla | Hefley | Riggs |
| Bono | Heineman | Roberts |
| Brownback | Herger | Rogers |
| Bryant (TN) | Hilleary | Rohrabacher |
| Bunn | Hobson | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Bunning | Hoekstra | Roth |
| Burr | Hoke | Royce |
| Burton | Horn | Salmon |
| Buyer | Hostettler | Sanford |
| Callahan | Houghton | Saxton |
| Calvert | Hunter | Scarborough |
| Camp | Hutchinson | Schaefer |
| Campbell | Hyde | Schiff |
| Canady | Inglis | Seastrand |
| Castle | Istook | Sensenbrenner |
| Chabot | Johnson (CT) | Shadegg |
| Chambliss | Jones | Shaw |
| Chrysler | Kasich | Shays |
| Clinger | Kelly | Shuster |
| Coble | Kim | Skeen |
| Coburn | King | Smith (MI) |
| Collins (GA) | Kingston | Smith (NJ) |
| Combest | Klug | Smith (TX) |
| Cooley | Knollenberg | Smith (WA) |
| Cox | Kolbe | Solomon |
| Crane | LaHood | Souder |
| Crapo | Largent | Spence |
| Cremeans | Latham | Stearns |
| Cubin | LaTourette | Stump |
| Cunningham | Lazio | Talent |
| Davis | Leach | Tate |
| Deal | Lewis (CA) | Tauzin |
| Diaz-Balart | Lewis (KY) | Thomas |
| Dickey | Lightfoot | Thornberry |
| Doolittle | Linder | Tiahrt |
| Dornan | Livingston | Torkildsen |
| Dreier | LoBiondo | Trafficant |
| Duncan | Longley | Upton |
| Dunn | Lucas | Vucanovich |
| Ehlers | Manzullo | Waldholtz |
| Ehrlich | Martini | Walker |
| Emerson | McCollum | Walsh |
| English | McCrery | Wamp |
| Ensign | McDade | Watts (OK) |
| Everett | McHugh | Weldon (FL) |
| Ewing | McInnis | Weldon (PA) |
| Fawell | McIntosh | Weller |
| Flanagan | McKeon | White |
| Foley | Metcalf | Whitfield |
| Forbes | Meyers | Wicker |
| Fowler | Mica | Wolf |
| Fox | Miller (FL) | Young (AK) |
| Franks (CT) | Molinari | Young (FL) |
| Franks (NJ) | Moorhead | Zeliff |
| Frelinghuysen | Morella | Zimmer |
| Frisa | Myers | |
| Funderburk | Myrick | |

NAYS—180

| | | |
|--------------|----------|------------|
| Abercrombie | Bentsen | Brown (CA) |
| Ackerman | Berman | Brown (FL) |
| Andrews | Bevill | Brown (OH) |
| Baesler | Bishop | Cardin |
| Baldacci | Bonior | Clay |
| Barcia | Borski | Clayton |
| Barrett (WI) | Boucher | Clement |
| Becerra | Brewster | Clyburn |
| Beilenson | Browder | Coleman |

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| Collins (MI) | Johnson, E. B. | Pelosi |
| Condit | Johnston | Peterson (FL) |
| Conyers | Kanjorski | Peterson (MN) |
| Costello | Kaptur | Pickett |
| Coyne | Kennedy (MA) | Pomeroy |
| Cramer | Kennedy (RI) | Poshard |
| Danner | Kennelly | Rahall |
| DeFazio | Kildee | Rangel |
| DeLauro | Klecza | Reed |
| Dellums | Klink | Richardson |
| Deutsch | LaFalce | Rivers |
| Dicks | Lantos | Roemer |
| Dingell | Levin | Rose |
| Dixon | Lewis (GA) | Roybal-Allard |
| Doggett | Lincoln | Sabo |
| Dooley | Lipinski | Sanders |
| Doyle | Lofgren | Sawyer |
| Edwards | Lowe | Schroeder |
| Engel | Luther | Schumer |
| Eshoo | Maloney | Scott |
| Evans | Manton | Serrano |
| Farr | Markey | Sisisky |
| Fattah | Martinez | Skaggs |
| Fazio | Mascara | Skelton |
| Fields (LA) | Matsui | Slaughter |
| Filner | McCarthy | Spratt |
| Foglietta | McDermott | Stark |
| Frank (MA) | McHale | Stenholm |
| Frost | McKinney | Studds |
| Furse | McNulty | Stupak |
| Gejdenson | Meehan | Tanner |
| Gephardt | Meek | Taylor (MS) |
| Gibbons | Menendez | Thompson |
| Gonzalez | Miller (CA) | Thornton |
| Gordon | Minge | Thurman |
| Gutierrez | Mink | Torres |
| Hall (OH) | Moakley | Torricelli |
| Hall (TX) | Mollohan | Towns |
| Hamilton | Montgomery | Velazquez |
| Harman | Moran | Vento |
| Hastings (FL) | Murtha | Visclosky |
| Hefner | Nadler | Volkmer |
| Hilliard | Neal | Ward |
| Hinchey | Oberstar | Waters |
| Holden | Obey | Watt (NC) |
| Hoyer | Olver | Williams |
| Jackson (IL) | Orton | Wise |
| Jackson-Lee | Owens | Woolsey |
| (TX) | Pallone | Wynn |
| Jacobs | Pastor | Yates |
| Jefferson | Payne (NJ) | |
| Johnson (SD) | Payne (VA) | |

NOT VOTING—25

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| Barton | Fields (TX) | Rush |
| Bryant (TX) | Flake | Stockman |
| Chapman | Ford | Stokes |
| Chenoweth | Gallegly | Taylor (NC) |
| Christensen | Green | Tejeda |
| Collins (IL) | Johnson, Sam | Waxman |
| de la Garza | Laughlin | Wilson |
| DeLay | Ortiz | |
| Durbin | Roukema | |

□ 1749

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order: House Joint Resolution 78, de novo; H.R. 2064, de novo; and House Concurrent Resolution 149 by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

BI-STATE DEVELOPMENT AGENCY BY THE STATES OF MISSOURI AND ILLINOIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 78, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 78, as amended.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 405, noes 0, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

AYES—405

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| Abercrombie | Coble | Frelinghuysen |
| Ackerman | Coburn | Frisa |
| Allard | Coleman | Frost |
| Andrews | Collins (GA) | Funderburk |
| Archer | Collins (MI) | Furse |
| Armey | Combest | Ganske |
| Bachus | Condit | Gejdenson |
| Baesler | Conyers | Gekas |
| Baker (CA) | Cooley | Gephardt |
| Baker (LA) | Costello | Geren |
| Baldacci | Cox | Gibbons |
| Ballenger | Coyne | Gilchrest |
| Barcia | Cramer | Gillmor |
| Barr | Crane | Gilman |
| Barrett (NE) | Crapo | Gonzalez |
| Barrett (WI) | Cremeans | Goodlatte |
| Bartlett | Cubin | Goodling |
| Bass | Cunningham | Gordon |
| Bateman | Danner | Goss |
| Becerra | Davis | Graham |
| Beilenson | Deal | Greenwood |
| Bentsen | DeFazio | Gunderson |
| Bereuter | DeLauro | Gutierrez |
| Berman | Dellums | Gutknecht |
| Bevill | Deutsch | Hall (OH) |
| Bilbray | Diaz-Balart | Hall (TX) |
| Bilirakis | Dickey | Hamilton |
| Bishop | Dicks | Hancock |
| Bliley | Dingell | Hansen |
| Blute | Dixon | Harman |
| Boehlert | Doggett | Hastert |
| Boehner | Dooley | Hastings (FL) |
| Bonilla | Doolittle | Hastings (WA) |
| Bonior | Dornan | Hayes |
| Bono | Doyle | Hayworth |
| Borski | Dreier | Hefley |
| Boucher | Duncan | Hefner |
| Brewster | Dunn | Heineman |
| Browder | Edwards | Herger |
| Brown (CA) | Ehlers | Hilleary |
| Brown (FL) | Ehrlich | Hilliard |
| Brown (OH) | Emerson | Hinchey |
| Brownback | Engel | Hobson |
| Bryant (TN) | English | Hoekstra |
| Bunn | Ensign | Hoke |
| Bunning | Eshoo | Holden |
| Burr | Evans | Horn |
| Burton | Everett | Hostettler |
| Buyer | Ewing | Houghton |
| Callahan | Farr | Hoyer |
| Calvert | Fattah | Hunter |
| Camp | Fawell | Hutchinson |
| Campbell | Fazio | Hyde |
| Canady | Fields (LA) | Inglis |
| Cardin | Filner | Istook |
| Castle | Flanagan | Jackson (IL) |
| Chabot | Foglietta | Jackson-Lee |
| Chambliss | Foley | (TX) |
| Chrysler | Forbes | Jacobs |
| Clay | Fowler | Jefferson |
| Clayton | Fox | Johnson (CT) |
| Clement | Frank (MA) | Johnson (SD) |
| Clinger | Franks (CT) | Johnson, E. B. |
| Clyburn | Franks (NJ) | Johnston |